



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,278	03/15/2005	Hiroshi Sato	3190-074	4130
33432 7590 07/31/2008 KILYK & BOWERSOX, P.L.L.C. 400 HOLIDAY COURT SUITE 102 WARRENTON, VA 20186				
EXAMINER				
GOLDBERG, JEANINE ANNE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1634				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/31/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,278

Applicant(s)

SATO ET AL.

Examiner

JEANINE A. GOLDBERG

Art Unit

1634

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-16 and 18-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 7-9,11,12,14-16 and 18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5,6,10,13 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the papers filed May 13, 2008. Currently, claims 1-2, 5-16, 18-21 are pending. Claims 7-9, 11-12, 14-16, 18 have been withdrawn as drawn to non-elected subject matter.
2. All arguments have been thoroughly reviewed but are deemed non-persuasive for the reasons which follow.
 - a. The 102 and 103 rejections have been withdrawn in view of the amendments to the claims to require the drug glucuronidation is 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol and the enzyme activity of the UGT1 molecule in drug glucuronidation would be lower than that of a UGT1 molecule without the 1456 mutation.

Priority

3. This application is a 371 of PCT/JP03/01475, filed February 13, 2003 and foreign priority application 2002-235029, filed August 12, 2002.

Drawings

4. The drawings are acceptable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112- Enablement

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the

Art Unit: 1634

art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Newly amended Claims 1-2, 5-6, 10, 13, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described by the court in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CA FC 1988). *Wands* states at page 1404,

"Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure would require undue experimentation have been summarized by the board in *Ex parte Forman*. They include (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims."

The nature of the invention and breadth of claims

The claims are drawn to an assay method for drug metabolizing activity of UGT1 comprising a step of detecting a mutation in exon 5 region of a gene coding for UGT that corresponds to nucleotide position 1456 in UGT1 which encodes an amino acid at position 486 such that the detection of the mutation determines the level of enzymatic activity would be lower than that of UGT1 without the mutation where in the drug glucuronidation is glucuronidation of 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol..

The claims have been narrowed to human subjects, where the mutation at position 1456 in UGT1 determines that the level of enzymatic activity of the UGT1

molecule is lower than that of a UGT1 molecule without the mutation, and the drug is 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol.

The claims remain broadly drawn to all isoforms.

The invention is in a class of invention which the CAFC has characterized as “the unpredictable arts such as chemistry and biology.” *Mycogen Plant Sci., Inc. v. Monsanto Co.*, 243 F.3d 1316, 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

The unpredictability of the art and the state of the prior art

Kurkela specifically teaches Y486D mutation was shown to reduced the activities of the UGT1A1 and UGT1A6. However, surprisingly, the corresponding mutation in the UGT1A9 doubled the Vmax of scopoletin glucuronidation, where as entacapone glucuronidation rate was decreased (abstract). Thus, there is no predictable nature of the glucuronidation between isoforms or different drugs. Kurkela suggests that the Y to D mutation in UGT1A9 might not be detrimental to enzymatic activity, thereby revealing isoform-specific differences due to extensive protein-protein interactions (page 2444, col. 1). Kurkela analyzes the activities of 1A9/Y483D towards scopoletin and entacapone (see Figure 2). The activity and kinetics results clearly show that in sharp contracts to the previous results with UGTs 1A1 and 1A6, the Y483 mutation increased the activity of UGT1A9, at least as far as scopoletin glucuronidation is concerned (page 2446, col. 1). Simply, the mutation affected the scopoletin and entacapone glucuronidation activities of UGT1A9 in different and opposite ways (page 2446, col. 2). Thus, it is clear that there is no predictability between isoforms and different drugs.

The art teaches genetic variations and associations are often irreproducible. Hirschhorn et al. (Genetics in Medicine. Vol. 4, No. 2, pages 45-61, March 2002)

teaches that most reported associations are not robust. Of the 166 associations studied three or more times, only 6 have been consistently replicated. Hirschhorn *et al.* suggest a number of reasons for the irreproducibility of studies, suggesting population stratification, linkage disequilibrium, gene-gene or gene-environment interactions, and weak genetic effects and lack of power are possible factors that lead to such irreproducibility. Hirschhorn *et al.* caution that the current irreproducibility of most association studies should raise a cautionary alarm when considering their use as diagnostics and prognostics (p. 60, Col. 2). Thus, Hirschhorn cautions in drawing conclusions from a single report of an association between a genetic variant and disease susceptibility.

Additionally, Ioannidis (Nature Genetics, Vol. 29, pages 306-309, November 2001) teaches that the results of the first study correlate only modestly with subsequent research on the same association (abstract). Ioannidis teaches that both bias and genuine population diversity might explain why early association studies tend to overestimate the disease protection or predisposition conferred by a genetic polymorphism (abstract).

Guidance in the Specification.

The specification teaches uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferases (UDP-glucuronosyltransferases, UGT) are enzymes that catalyze glucuronidation of various drugs (page 1). The specification teaches that the different UGT enzymes conjugate different substrates (page 1-2). The specification analyzes 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol glucuronide which is glucuronidated by UGT. The specification states that "as long as drugs to be assayed by the invention are glucuronidated by UGT,

Art Unit: 1634

they are useful for assay of their metabolism" (page 15, lines 20-26). The specification provides a short list of examples (page 15-16). The specification measured UGT activity with bilirubin and 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol glucuronide as a substrate (page 20). The UGT1A1 molecule UGT gene mutation Y485D (homozygous) was 8% UGT relative activity (page 20). The UGT1A1 molecule UGT gene mutation Y485D (heterozygous) was 36%.

Table 1, page 20, appears to be directed to UGT1A1 molecules with the bilirubin substrate. Page 7, teaches the UGT1A1 mutant has a maximum velocity of about 12% relative to the maximum velocity of the wild type, and had a Km value which was about half of that of the wild type with respect to 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol. Moreover, Table 2, page 21, appears to be UGT1A6 molecules with 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol as a substrate. The specification does not appear to analyze UGT1A3, UGT1A4, UGT1A5, UGT1A7, UGT1A8 or UGT1A9. Thus, it is unpredictable whether these isoforms would have similarly enzyme activity in response to drug glucuronidation.

The guidance provided by the specification amounts to an invitation for the skilled artisan to try and follow the disclosed instructions to make and use the claimed invention as broadly as claimed.

Quantity of Experimentation

The quantity of experimentation in this area is extremely large since there is significant number of parameters which would have to be studied

The claims are drawn to glucuronidation of UGT1 isoforms by detecting a mutation at position 1456 in UGT1A1 which encodes an amino acid at position 486 of UGT1A1. The claims remain drawn to detecting a mutation at nucleotide 1456 in the genetic sequence of UGT1 which encodes an amino acid at position 486 of UGT1A1 to deterring the level of enzymatic activity of the UGT1 molecule as lower than that of a UGT1 molecule without the mutation in any isoform. The specification analyzed the UGT1A6 and UGT1A1 isoforms and their mutants with respect to -amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol (see page 7-8). The specification indicates there are additional isoforms of UGT1 including UGT1A3, UGT1A4, UGT1A5, UGT1A7, UGT1A8 or UGT1A9. The art illustrates different isoforms have different enzyme levels and are not predictably associated with one another. Kurkela illustrates the different isoforms have different responses. Kurkela compares the 1A9 and the 1A6 isoforms and finds differences in the effect of the Y483D mutation between the two isoforms (see page 2448, col. 2). Kurkela finds that the C-terminal half of both is identical at the level of amino acid sequence, and the differences in effect must have emerged from differences within the N-terminal half. Therefore, Kurkela illustrates the differences in isoform and the ability to glucuronidate drugs. The skilled artisan would be required to perform further, unpredictable experimentation to determine how the UGT1A9 and the other isoforms encompassed by the claim would be affected. While the skilled artisan could perform the experimentation, the results of the experimentation are unpredictable and undue. This would require significant inventive effort, with each of the many intervening steps, upon effective reduction to practice, not providing any guarantee of success in the succeeding steps.

Level of Skill in the Art

The level of skill in the art is deemed to be high.

Conclusion

In the instant case, as discussed above, in a highly unpredictable art of associating polymorphisms with particular condition, the broad scope of the claims would not be enabled at the time the invention was made. Further, the prior art and the specification provides insufficient guidance to overcome the art recognized. Thus given the broad claims in an art whose nature is identified as unpredictable, the unpredictability of that art, the large quantity of research required to define these unpredictable variables, the lack of guidance provided in the specification, the absence of a working example and the negative teachings in the prior art balanced only against the high skill level in the art, it is the position of the examiner that it would require undue experimentation for one of skill in the art to perform the method of the claim as broadly written.

Response to Arguments

The response traverses the rejection. The response reviews the teachings of the specification and the mutation at Y486D. The response further asserts that Meyer does not relate to isoforms of an enzyme. While this argument has been reviewed and found persuasive, the art teaches different isoforms of an enzyme have different effects, see Kurkela.

The response addresses the teachings of Kurkela and concludes that the findings of Kurkela are not inconsistent with the teachings of the present application. The response asserts that Kurkela shows that a mutation in UGT1A9 affects the

Art Unit: 1634

glucuronidation activity of both scopletin and entacapone. The arguments further state that the decrease in UGT activity relates to the activity of a preferred embodiment and nowhere does the present application state that the changes in UGT1 activity by the mutation are limited to a decrease in UGT activity. This argument has been reviewed but is not persuasive. The instant claims have been limited to:

determining that, when the mutation in an exon 5 region encoding a UGT1 molecule is detected, the level of enzymatic activity of the UGT1 molecule in drug glucuronidation in the subject would be lower than that of a UGT1 molecule without the mutation;

This passage explicitly limits the claims to level of enzyme activity in the subject with the mutation would be lower than that without the mutation. Thus, the claims do specifically limit the claims to a decrease in UGT activity. For the reasons provided above, it is unpredictable which isoforms have a decrease in UGT1 activity in response to a mutation at 486 and 2-amino-5-nitro-4-trifluoromethylphenol drug.

Thus for the reasons above and those already of record, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

6. No claims allowable.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Jeanine Goldberg whose telephone number is (571) 272-0743. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla, can be reached on (571) 272-0735.

Art Unit: 1634

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

The Central Fax Number for official correspondence is (571) 273-8300.

**/Jeanine A Goldberg/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1634
July 31, 2008**